



Woodland Enterprise Centre, Hastings Road, Flimwell, East Sussex TN5 7PR

Telephone 07722 154697

E-mail: alex.arborweald@gmail.com Website: arborweald.co.uk

Tree survey results for *Acer rubrum*, *Gleditsia triacanthos* and *Corylus avellana* at Appledore, Wyatts Lane, Horsted Keynes RH17 7AH.

Ref: DKS/1980.1

Dated: 28/08/2026

Red= Require urgent action. Orange= Priority work within 6 months to 1 year as specified. Green= Within 5 years.

Crown spread: Small (S)= < 5 metres, Medium (M)= <10 metres, Large (L)= >10 metres. DBH= stem diameter measurement @ breast height in millimetres (mm). Height approx.(m); PC= physiological condition; SC= structural condition

Tree no.	Species	Height (m)	DBH (mm)	Crown spread	Condition	Location	Observations and recommendations
T1	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	14	315	Medium	SC: Average PC: Average-good	Rear garden adjacent to northern boundary.	Roots: Unimpeded rooting to all cardinal points, garden shed to west 4m away, unlikely to be affecting root spread. Laurel hedge at northern boundary, recently pruned will be competing and allelopathic. Lawn area within rooting area moderately compacted with consistent mowing and garden usage. No fungal fruiting bodies observed within rooting area at time of inspection.

							T1 contd. Base: No resonance indicating internal dysfunction and/or decay, no fungal fruiting bodies observed at base and lower stem at time of inspection, base sound. Stem: No indicators of decay and/or dysfunction on main stem, no anomalous bark and or stem deformation that could indicate structural issues. Crown: Crown break at 3m consists of 3 main stems, moderately tight unions and minor inclusion at stem unions, not unusual for species, no signs of stress at unions indicating potential failure. Crown is congested with multiple crossing and conflicting branches, some with associated notch stress points- minor. Crown condition is good with minimal signs of stress, unusual with recent weather conditions. Tree is competing with adjacent sycamore within rear garden of neighbouring property to the north. Foliage: No discolouration of abnormalities. Recommendations: Thin crown, by removing conflicting and duplicate branches, before February 2027, where conflicting branches have fully absorbed do not remove. Reduce height and lateral spread by a maximum of 2.5m, before February 2027 then maintain tree at smaller dimensions with cyclical crown reductions as informed by tree response and regrowth. Ideally reduce neighbouring sycamore to similar dimensions to minimise competition between these two trees. Conduct soil amelioration within rooting area to improve rhizosphere condition (Appendix 2)
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Tree no.	Species	Height (m)	DBH (mm)	Crown spread	Condition	Location	Observations and recommendations
T2	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	13	305	Medium	SC: Average-good PC: Average	Rear garden adjacent to southern boundary.	Roots: Rooting unimpeded to all cardinal points. Cherry laurel hedge at southern boundary within rooting area of this tree has been recently reduced but would have competed for nutrients and is allelopathic, contributing to crown stress. Lawn to north of tree as with T1 is moderately compacted by everyday garden usage. No fungal fruiting bodies observed within rooting area at time of inspection. Some historic damage to surface roots likely mower- minor. Base: No resonance indicating internal dysfunction and/or decay, no fungal fruiting bodies observed at base and lower stem at time of inspection, base sound. Stem: No indicators of decay and/or dysfunction on main stem, no anomalous bark and or stem deformation that could indicate structural issues. Crown: Tree is codominant at 2.5m with an open union and no signs of inclusion. Good union formation throughout crown with no tight unions- unusual for species. Crown suppressed by adjacent larger trees, resulting in biased crown to East, large <i>Pinus radiata</i> in neighbouring garden to west, much larger tree, upper western upper canopy conflicting. Tree is under stress with minor crown dieback, due to competition, recent drought conditions and adjacent cherry laurel. Small diameter deadwood present throughout crown- min risk due to size. Lowest lateral EES is becoming extended (chasing the light), no signs of subsidence with anomalous union or canopy gaps. Foliage: Normal, no signs of abnormalities or poor colour indicating nutrient deficiency.

							T2 contd. Recommendations: Remove deadwood at the same time as reduction works to adjacent T1. Monitor PC in early summer 2027 to ascertain condition and response to drought, laurel reduction and maple reduction, to inform future management and retention. Monitor extended limb for subsidence. Conduct soil amelioration in grassed areas within canopy drip line (Appendix 2).
T3	<i>Corylus avellana</i>	7	135 multi	Small	SC: Average PC: Average-good	Front garden at property entrance, north side	Roots: Rooting restricted to south and west by entrance, driveway – historic, tree had been growing in this location for a long time. Unrestricted to other cardinal points. No fungal fruiting bodies observed within rooting area at time of inspection. Base: Usual tight unions with inclusion associated with coppice form, tree is not particularly overstood. Stem: Some stem-to-stem conflict again not unusual for coppice form. Crown: Minimal signs of stress and crown dieback tree is coping well with recent drought conditions. Overhead services to SE, telephone cable within 1m, electrical cable higher at 1.5m away from canopy (insulated). Foliage: Some yellowing- minor likely due to recent drought stress. Leaf size normal. Recommendations: Maintain clearance with overhead services, coppice before becoming overstood within the 3 years dependent on growth, then maintain with cyclical coppicing every 8-10 years dependent on regrowth and before becoming overstood.

Appendix 1: Report Validity

This visual tree assessment report contains observations captured on the date of surveying; trees are dynamic organisms that can change in relatively short periods of time; external influences that occur after surveying such as extreme weather events and site changes may also affect tree condition and would invalidate survey results.

This tree report is therefore invalid if any of the following occur:

- Monitoring dates and/or timescales for reinspection as specified within Tree Table have lapsed.
- Dates and/or timescales for undertaking remedial tree work/s as specified within Tree Table have lapsed.
- The occurrence of an extreme weather event (for example a Met Office weather warning) that includes surveyed trees.
- Any significant site use changes occur within the influence of surveyed trees, such as site development.

Adherence to tree survey recommendations as specified will help to ensure the validity of this report.

Appendix 3: Simple Soil Amelioration

Where tree condition is being compromised due to compacted ground conditions, the following simple methodology is recommended:

- Insert a garden fork to half depth every 0.5m² within compacted soil within the rooting are of the tree.
- Lever the fork back and forth to loosen the soil, no digging/turning soil should take place.
- Forking should avoid visible surface roots and the trees' structural root plate (the large roots closest to the base/stem).
- Well composted (not fresh) mulch/wood chip should be added if possible as a shallow (≤ 150 mm) layer in order to further enhance the available rooting medium and to minimise future compaction where possible.
- Where possible, an area (as large as possible) surrounding the tree should be set aside for mulching.

The above method, if carried out effectively, and repeated as suggested **will** improve the rooting opportunities of surveyed trees, resulting in improved tree condition, and save costs on remedial tree pruning and/or tree removal.

References

British Standard Institute (BSI). British Standard BS3998: Tree work – Recommendations, BSI.

Lonsdale D. (2013). *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management*, The Stationary Office.

Mattheck C and Breloer H. (1994). *The body language of trees A handbook for failure analysis*, Her Majesty's Stationary Office

National Tree Safety Group. (2011). *Common sense risk management of trees*. Forestry Commission.

The Health and Safety Executive. (2013). *Management of the risk from falling trees and branches*. Sector Information Minute (SIM) 01/2007/05. The Health and Safety Executive.